## Exhibit B

```
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
1
2
                   WESTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK
3
    MOOG INC.,
 4
                                      22-CV-187
                      Plaintiff
5
    VS.
                                   Buffalo, New York
    SKYRYSE, INC., et al
6
                                    August 4, 2022
                                 )
                    Defendant.
7
    DISCOVERY HEARING
8
    Proceeding held via Zoom for Government Platform
    All parties appeared remotely.
9
    Transcribed from audio of Zoom for Government Platform
                    TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
10
           BEFORE THE HONORABLE JEREMIAH J. MCCARTHY
11
                  UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
12
    FOR PLAINTIFF: SHEPPHARD MULLIN RICHETER & HAMPTON, LLP
13
                     BY: RENA ANDOH, ESQ.
                         LAI YIP, ESQ.
14
                         KAZIM A. NAQVI, ESQ.
                         TRAVIS ANDERSON, ESQ.
15
                              -and-
                     HODGSON RUSS, LLP
16
                     BY: ROBERT J. FLUSKEY, JR, ESQ.
                         PAULINE MUTO, ESQ.
17
    FOR DEFENDANT:
                     LATHAM & WATKINS, LLP
                     BY: DOUGLAS E. LUMISH, ESQ.
18
                         GABRIEL S. GROSS, ESQ.
19
                         KELLEY STOREY, ESQ.
                         CASSANDRA M. BALOGA, ESQ.
20
                         JULIANNE CATHERINE OSBORNE, ESQ.
                         RYAN T. BANKS, ESQ.
2.1
                         JOSEPH LEE, ESQ.
                         ARMAN ZAHOORY, ESQ.
22
    FOR DEFENDANT
23
    PILKINGTON/KIM: WINGET, SPADAFORA & SCHWARTZBERG, LLP
                     BY: ALEXANDER ASHER TRUITT, ESQ.
24
                         ANTHONY D. GREEN, ESQ.
                         ANNABEL MIRALES, ESQ.
25
    COURT REPORTER: Karen J. Clark, Official Court Reporter
                     Karenclark1013@AOL.com
```

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

MOOG, INC. VS. SYRYSE, INC, ET AL want to focus, for today's purposes, on what precipitated Ms. Andoh's August 1st e-mail, the fact that the individual Defendants, I quess, shortly after our conference last week, advised Moog that they were going to rescind permission to access any of their devices due to potential Fifth Amendment concerns. And I quess my initial question is why didn't -- I know we talked during the conference last week about the possibility of a stay and the possible consequences of Fifth Amendment concerns, and, in fact, I set a briefing schedule on the motion to stay, which was going to be argued in September, but I'm wondering why the fact that the individual Defendants were going to prohibit access to their devices wasn't put on the table during our conference last week. Mr. Green, I quess I'll ask you that. Well, it came after MR. GREEN: consideration of what we discussed in that conference, and also further review of documents that indicated that Moog has been acting hand in glove with the FBI and acting almost as an agent of the government. And at this point, given we're going to deal with the motion to

stay anyway, we're going to deal with Fifth Amendment

issues, it seems prudent to have -- to halt access, at

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

MOOG, INC. VS. SYRYSE, INC, ET AL

this point, while we determine whether we need to assert

Fifth Amendment privileges. Because, by the time that

we performed our privilege review, it was for

attorney/client privilege, not the Fifth Amendment

privilege. This issue arose later, and I believe we do

need to go through those devices once we receive the

information I believe we need.

MAGISTRATE JUDGE MCCARTHY: Well, let me just say, and we'll get into the merits of that, but I'll just say at the outset that I really would have preferred that that would have been put in issue during our last conference because then I'm hit with a ton of e-mails going back and forth. And these things could have been at least flushed out in a somewhat more orderly fashion had I been aware last week that this was in the offing. But, be that as it may, let me ask Moog's counsel, and if there is some reason work product privilege or whatever else you want to raise as to why you don't want to answer this question, I'll certainly consider that, but whose idea was it to commence a criminal investigation? I mean, did the Government, on its own, just decide to do that, maybe reading something in the paper somewhere, or did Moog precipitate the criminal investigation?

```
MOOG, INC. VS. SYRYSE, INC, ET AL
1
2
    then I really appreciate that clarification. That would
3
    be fine with Skyryse.
 4
                MAGISTRATE JUDGE MCCARTHY: Consider it
    clarified.
5
6
                MR. GROSS: Thank you.
7
                MAGISTRATE JUDGE MCCARTHY: All right.
                                                          Then
    I will -- we'll proceed along those timelines. And,
8
9
    again, the other motions that were filed, we will get to
    them, but we'll take it from there. And thank you all
10
11
    and I brought it in with seven minutes to spare. So
12
    there we go. Thank you all.
13
                MR. GREEN: Thank you, your Honor.
14
                MS. ANDOH: Thank you, your Honor.
15
                MR. GROSS: Thank you, your Honor.
16
17
                      <u>CERTIFICATE OF</u> REPORTER
18
19
       I certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript
20
    of the record to the best of my ability of proceedings
    transcribed from the audio in the above-entitled matter.
2.1
22
23
    S/ Karen J. Clark, RPR
24
    Official Court Reporter
25
```